

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/412,897	10/05/1999	SVERRE SLOTTE	297-008927-U	1254
75	590 03/29/2004		EXAM	INER
CLARENCE A GREEN PERMAN & GREEN			TRAN, THIEN D	
425 POST ROA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FAIRFIELD, CT 06430			2665	
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)					
- Advisory Action	09/412,897	SLOTTE ET AL.				
4	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thien D Tran	2665				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if						
imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE: .</li></ul>						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
0. Other:						



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Chung does not disclose a method for complementing a telephone connection. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses a method for portable phone call initiation for connection (method for complementing a telephone connection, recited in the specification on page 3 line 34). See col.9 lines 38-39. Applicant argues that Chung does not disclose a signalling message comprising addition information in association with a telephone connection. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses a signalling word (signallling message) having a control field, which divided into fields such as message identifying, addresses identifying, call identifying...etc (additional filed) for setting up (association with) the telephone call connection. See col.9 lines 28-45, col.11 lines 10-15. Applicant argues that Chung does not disclose indicating within signalling message having an intended receiving part within the receiving device. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses in control field of a signalling word, an indicating the addresses of source and destination portables (receiving part of receiving device. For example, the address will be delivered to the address identifying block inside the portable). See col.11 lines 10-15.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant argues that Chung does not discloses a certain protocol used in the signalling message. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses a field for indicating protocol type in a control field of a signalling word. See col.11 lines 25-30.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant argues that a certain coding scheme used in a signalling message. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses a coding field used for coding messages (certain coding scheme) in the signalling word. See col.11 lines 5-10.

Regarding claim 4, Applicant argues that Chung does not disclose combining length of header fields in the signally messages. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses an indication of the length of the control field (combined fields of the header). See col.9 lines 14-15.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant argues that Chung does not disclose that signaling unit is additionally arranged to receive a signaling message from another telecommunication device in association with a payload information transmission connection, and to direct at least part of the received signaling message to a certain functional block within the telecommunication device according to an indication contained in the received signaling message. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Chung discloses microcontroller 107 (signalling unit) additional arrange to receive control signals data signals (payload information) from other portable (another communication device) in association with, wherein part of control fields (signallling message) directed to ADPCM (certain functional block) for processing. See col.15 lines 50-65, col.16 lines 5-15.

STEVEN H. D NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER